

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Education & Learning
----------------------	----------------------

Title
Early Years Funding – Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	x	Over how many years is the funding required?	One
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	194	0

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Chris Malone Date of Sign Off: 06/12/17</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone Date of Sign Off: 06/12/17</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

Quality of Early Education

In order to comply with national requirements, from 1st April 2018 we must achieve a minimum of 95% pass-through of funding to early years providers. This means that centrally retained funding (for early years central education services) combined with any funding movement out of the early years block will be constrained to a maximum of 5% from 2018-19 compared to the 7% allowed in 2017/18. In Warwickshire the reduction from 7% to 5% means a reduction in funding of approximately £500,000 for central education services to support the early years sector. Whilst plans for absorbing most of this reduction are in place, £120,000 is needed to continue to invest in improving early years education.

Family Support

Family support workers work with families with complex needs to improve outcomes for children and families after intervention. The current DSG contribution comprises 25% of the current Family Support Workers service and therefore a wholesale reduction of the budget would have a significant impact on the service. Allocating £74,000 to maintain the service at existing funding levels for 2018/19 would enable the service to continue in its current form until a fundamental review of the DSG and early years DSG takes place to ensure the service is on a long term sustainable footing.

To address these issues we will need to:

- maintain funding for improving the quality of early education by £120,000
- add £74,000 to the Family Support budget to maintain current service.

Reason for the Request

Quality of Early Education

In December 2016, local authorities were informed of the new requirements on the amount of funding for 3 and 4 year-olds that must be passed to providers for early education places (nurseries, pre-schools, some childminders). This pass-through requirement is intended to ensure the maximum amount of funding allocated to local authorities by the Government reaches providers.

In response to these changes and to strengthen our support for early years provision we will maintain the £120,000 allocation to improve the quality of early education.

Family Support

Losing all or a significant part of DSG funding in the Family & Parenting Support budget would equate to the loss of 2.1 FTE family support workers.

The short timescale of removal or reduction in DSG funding means that there is not enough time to make changes to staffing, which a removal or reduction in funding would necessitate. We therefore want to maintain funding for family support workers by adding £74,000 to the service budget.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

The submission has been prepared on the assumption that a fundamental review of DSG to include the Early Years DSG will take place by June 2018 with a report to the Schools Forum in September 2018, therefore this funding is requested for one year only.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

Quality of Early Education

The £120,000 would be used to commission training and support for Early Years Private, Voluntary & Independent providers. The training would provide commissioned support that improves the quality of early years education in Warwickshire, that would be evidenced, for example, by increases in Good Levels of Development and an increase in the number of good and outstanding settings.

Early years and childcare providers do not currently buy services at full cost recovery rates. The requested £120,000 for improving quality would allow for a continued subsidised offer and would enable the traded offer to providers to develop.

Family Support Workers

Replacing the £74,000 of funding lost from the DSG contribution would avoid the loss of 2.1 FTE family support workers, who contribute to reducing the number of children requiring Level 4 intervention, to reducing the number of looked after children, and contribute to improved outcomes for children and families.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Quality of Early Education

The risk of not increasing funding in this area is that more providers of early education fall into "Inadequate", thus challenging the local authority duty for sufficient places for both early education and for childcare. Warwickshire's early years and childcare providers are already funded at a lower rate than statistical neighbours. Their ability to purchase training from the nursery schools is therefore not strong.

Family Support Workers

If the DSG contribution to Family Support Workers was reduced by £74,000 this would equate to the loss of 2.1 FTEs. A reduction in staffing would reduce the level of support available to families, and could result in an increase in the number of children requiring Level 4 intervention, and/or with poor outcomes.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Based on existing budgets.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Transport & Economy
----------------------	---------------------

Title
HS2 Phase 1 delivery & Phase 2b Hybrid Bill

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	X	Over how many years is the funding required?	3+
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	235	200

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Mark Ryder Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The additional spending need is required to fund:

- the necessary research/ evidence preparation for the Phase 2b Hybrid Bill
- the legal fees (corporate, Parliamentary Agent and QC) to prepare and appear before the Commons and Lords Select committees from 2019 (this is similar to the experience in Phase 1 from 2014-17)
- the partially unmet salary of the officer discharging the consents regime in Phase 1
- the engagement with North Warwickshire communities to support them during their experience of the Hybrid Bill and appearance at the Select Committees in Parliament

Reason for the Request

HS2 Phase 1 is now an Act of Parliament and requires WCC to engage and discharge a number of additional statutory duties, some of which will be recoverable via an SLA with HS2.

Additionally Phase 2b was confirmed in July 2017 – this affects a number of North Warwickshire communities along the route and 3 key assets; Kingsbury Water Park, J10/ M42 and Pooley Park, each of which could have a significant detrimental effect on the economy and vitality of North Warwickshire if they are not fully mitigated beyond the hybrid bill bare minimum requirement.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

- The recoverable funds from HS2 will not cover all costs of supporting all of the council services and communities affected by HS2. This is because the petitioning and community support elements are excluded by HS2 as recoverable costs.
- Staff levels remain constant at 3.8FTE
- HS2 provides for reimbursement of other officer time at cost which may conflict with the charging mechanisms and surplus targets in place for some groups e.g. Design Services
- HS2 Phase 2b hybrid bill progresses at published timeframe and WCC is heard in the Commons Select Committee in the early stages (otherwise 19/20 spend profile will be delayed)

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will provide the necessary revenue resource to develop mitigation plans that fully recognise the value of the country parks as community assets and revenue generating services of the council.

The evidence and petition work for J10/M42 will support wider economic policies of the Combined Authority and economic growth corridor along the A5 and the sub regional ambition for further

investment. Failure to secure a holistic and shared mitigation package will fetter future economic investment plans for the North Warwickshire growth corridor and the wider ambitions of the Combined Authority/ Midland Engine.

There are unavoidable evidence and legal costs to promote the mitigation necessary in North Warwickshire.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Without support the revenue viability of both Parks (and their concessions 200+ local jobs) will be seriously compromised by the impact of the HS2 construction works. Part of the request will be used to create a case for compensation and a means of mitigating the revenue impact on the Parks service. If the parks do see a revenue reduction in their service it will have an impact on their ability to deliver their OOP 2020 savings targets.

In the case of the M42 junction, there would have to be a bare minimum solution that would not support the economic growth of North Warwickshire and the A5 economic corridor.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Salaries of 3.8FTE = £171k (17/18 levels £171,724)
Previous legal costs (corporate, Parliamentary Agent and QC) based on Phase 1= £20k
Known research/ evidence development need to support the draft ES , ES and petitioning of the Houses of Parliament (based on Phase 1) =£30k
Allocation for community engagement/ not covered by HS2 reimbursement = £14k


OOP 2020 Application for a Permanent Reduction of a Savings Target

Business Unit	Public Health
----------------------	---------------

OOP Reference	Description of Saving
CG-PH-02	Drug and Alcohol -reduction in costs, prioritised through a redesign and recommissioning process.

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Amount of Saving that will not be achieved	350 to 400*	350 to 400*

*The current profile of savings is £1.3 million by 2018/19, however it is being requested that this is reduced (above) and rephased into 2019/20 (see OOP2020 savings plan refresh form)

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the OOP 2020 saving proposal can no longer be delivered and • Satisfied with both the content of the analysis and the rigour with which the business case of all alternative savings options has been compiled <p>Responsible Head of Service: </p> <p>Date of Sign Off: 11.09.17</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the reduction in the savings plan has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone</p> <p>Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Why can't this saving now be delivered?

This is a high risk area. Public Health have a requirement to meet the grant conditions for these services. This requires us to deliver a viable and quality service for the minimum cost.

The service has already reduced its budget since 2015/16 from over £5m and this has included WCC staffing reductions

We incurred a 12 month delay as a result of the elections limited the pace of retendering.

We have also disaggregated OPCC contributions from the main contracts where there have similarly been budget reductions.

We have collaborated locally across the West Midlands to assess the market costs for substance misuse contract awards.

We have also extracted the in-patient and rehabilitation elements of the costs rather than include them with the new contract to assert continued and greater financial control over these expensive service elements.

See the "Public Health savings" file attached for further detail on the Public Health savings which impacts the ability to meet the D&A saving.



Public Health savings
from 2015-16 to 2018

What alternative options for delivering the saving have been considered and why is it not prosed these should be taken forward? (Please attach a separate appraisal for each option, if needed)

In light of the better practice service models from elsewhere, we feel unable to guarantee a viable service at the OOP2020 level of service.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Drugs and Alcohol is our biggest OOP2020 savings target at £1.3m

All our other services have reached the maximum reduction to service.

As part of this piece of work we have calculated the reduction to our commissioned services since 1 April 2013. This totals £5.5m excluding the savings for OOP202.

Public Health savings have been used to reinvest in high need areas either recurrently or as one off investments.

Failure to deliver would require us to consider alternative savings in other areas which in turn would compromise the imperative to meet our mandated requirement

What actions would be necessary for the Business Unit/Group if the funding were not provided?

We would have to consider stopping other services including those that are mandated.

Refresh of the 2017-20 Savings Plan

Business Unit	Public Health
Head of Service	John Linnane

Current Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal (as per OOP 2020)	Original Cash Saving		Why the saving cannot proceed as planned
		2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	
	List only those savings proposals being amended with the current level of savings they are expected to deliver			
CG-PH-02	Drugs and Alcohol - a reduction in costs, prioritised through a redesign and recommissioning process	923	0	See "Public Health savings report" and "Savings permanent reduction form-D&A" See "Public Health savings report".
CG-PH-03	Healthwatch - re-tendering and redesign of the service to allow greater use of different channels, of volunteers and alignment with other similar agencies	45	0	
CG-PH-04	Dietetics - retain the acute provision and move community provision towards the preventative approach with access criteria and lower priority requirements accessed through other community provision.	200	0	
CG-PH-05	Reduce staffing and overheads across the Business Unit	100	100	
CG-PH-06	Smoking Cessation - redesign services to accommodate the changes in how the public are choosing to quit smoking	100	0	
CG-PH-07	Health Visitors and Family Nurse Practitioners - reduction in costs, prioritised through a redesign and recommissioning process	735	0	
CG-PH-08	Advocacy - retendering and redesign of the service, combining the two advocacy approaches into one (see proposed saving from Healthwatch)	85	0	
	Total	2,188	100	

Please note that in all cases the amount of the saving for 2018/19 and 2019/20 should be the additional amount to be delivered in future years i.e. excluding the saving to be delivered in 2017/18 where budgets have already been reduced.

Proposed Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal	Proposed Cash Saving		How does the proposal link to the OOP strategic outcomes
		2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	
	List only amended/new savings proposals with the proposed level of savings they are expected to deliver.			
CG-PH-02	Drugs and Alcohol - a reduction in costs, prioritised through a redesign and recommissioning process	0	523	Strategic outcomes remain the same but the market will not deliver a viable service based on the current levels of reduction proposed in OOP2020. See "Savings permanent reduction form-D&A" Strategic outcomes will be unchanged, but due to delays described in "Public Health savings report" it is requested that the savings are re-phased into 2019/20
CG-PH-03	Healthwatch - re-tendering and redesign of the service to allow greater use of different channels, of volunteers and alignment with other similar agencies	0	45	
CG-PH-04	Dietetics - retain the acute provision and move community provision towards the preventative approach with access criteria and lower priority requirements accessed through other community provision.	0	200	
CG-PH-05	Reduce staffing and overheads across the Business Unit	0	200	
CG-PH-06	Smoking Cessation - redesign services to accommodate the changes in how the public are choosing to quit smoking	0	100	
CG-PH-07	Health Visitors and Family Nurse Practitioners - reduction in costs, prioritised through a redesign and recommissioning process	0	735	
CG-PH-08	Advocacy - retendering and redesign of the service, combining the two advocacy approaches into one (see proposed saving from Healthwatch)	0	85	
	Total	0	1,888	

Reconciliation

		2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	
	Original savings plan	2,188	100	
	less			
	Proposed savings plan	0	1,888	
	Total	2,188	(1,788)	

The totals on this table must all equal zero

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Education & Learning
----------------------	----------------------

Title
SENDAR Budget Pressures

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Budget funding required to support permanent posts (SENDAR structural deficit)	£413	£413
Budget funding to meet statutory requirement (SENDAR)	£434	£412
Budget funding to meet statutory expectations (SENDAR Commissions)	£186	£186
Total funding requirement	£1,033	£1,011

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, ● Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and ● Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Date of Sign Off:</p>

Finance sign off

I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone

Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The Special Educational Needs and Disability Assessment and Review (SENDAR) team is the key operational service for assessing, issuing and reviewing EHC plans.

The spending is required to maintain current staffing levels in SENDAR. In recent years the budget has been propped up by the SEND Implementation Grant (ends in March 2018) and resources set aside by the Head of Service to meet future years' savings. The SEND Grant has also funded commissioned statutory work, such as Information, Advice and Support and Education Psychology assessments. From April 2018, current funding levels cannot be maintained due to future saving plans and the ending of the SEND Grant. The Head of Service notified Corporate Board in 2014 that the previous savings of £0.250m applied to SENDAR were considered unachievable and the SEND Grant would be used to cover this gap.

In addition to current staffing, further recruitment is needed to SENDAR in order to improve the performance of the service and bring caseloads into line with neighbouring authorities.

The forecast expenditure of the service in 2017/18 is £1.016m. Assuming the same expenditure in 2018/19, this presents a resource gap of £0.413m. A further £0.434m is required to increase SENDAR to staffing levels required to meet statutory requirements and £0.186m is required to maintain existing commissions of statutory work currently funded through the SEND Grant.

The service carries out the statutory functions of the local authority, as set out in the SEND Code of Practice (related to part 3 of the Children and Families Act 2014). A summary of the statutory requirement is set out below (SEND Code of Practice references are in brackets):

- A local authority **must** conduct an assessment of education, health and care needs when it considers that it may be necessary for special educational provision to be made for the child or young person in accordance with an EHC plan. (9.3)
- Local authorities **must** consult the child and the child's parent or the young person throughout the process of assessment and production of an EHC plan. (9.21)
- Local authorities are responsible for ensuring that there is effective co-ordination of the

assessment and development process for an EHC plan. (9.30)

- The local authority **must** gather advice from relevant professionals about the child or young person's education, health and care needs, desired outcomes and special educational, health and care provision that may be required to meet identified needs and achieve desired outcomes. (9.46)
- Where, in the light of an EHC needs assessment, it is necessary for special educational provision to be made in accordance with an EHC plan, the local authority **must** prepare a plan (9.53)
- The whole process of EHC needs assessment and EHC plan development, from the point when an assessment is requested until the final EHC plan is issued, must take no more than 20 weeks. (9.40)
- EHC plans should be used to actively monitor children and young people's progress towards their outcomes and longer term aspirations. They **must** be reviewed by the local authority as a minimum every 12 months. (9.166)

In addition, the SEND Grant has funded commissions for statutory work from Educational Psychology Service and SEND Information, Advice and Support in line with increased demand. The relevant references from SEND Code of Practice are below:

- Advice and information **must** be sought as follows: Psychological advice and information from an educational psychologist who should normally be employed or commissioned by the local authority (9.49)
- Local authorities **must** arrange for children with SEN or disabilities for whom they are responsible, and their parents, and young people with SEN or disabilities for whom they are responsible, to be provided with information and advice about matters relating to their SEN or disabilities, including matters relating to health and social care (2.2) Information, Advice and Support Services should be impartial, confidential and accessible and should have the capacity to handle face-to-face, telephone and electronic enquiries (2.5).

The statutory function carried out by SENDAR is crucial to ensure the fair allocation, monitoring and control of resources identified in EHC plans. Effective EHC assessment, planning and review by SENDAR is the primary mechanism for distributing over £34m of expenditure on SEND. Any impediment to SENDAR delivering a high quality service, also acts as an impediment to ensuring that Warwickshire is receiving value for money from the Dedicated Schools Grant (High Needs Block).

Reason for the Request

Even with additional funding from the SEND Implementation Grant and other budgets set aside by the Head of Service, the SENDAR service is below the required capacity to meet demand and expected performance levels. A separate business case is being prepared for Corporate Board regarding

additional capacity.

The key performance indicator for the service is the percentage of EHC plans issued within 20 weeks of referral (statutory timescale). The national target is 90%, and the national average is 56%. At Q1, Warwickshire was at 41% (an improvement on 2016/17).

The poor performance of the service, due to capacity, leads to an increase in queries and complaints to the service. A significant amount of time is taken up resolving these queries and complaints, particularly at senior management level. When a complaint escalates to a tribunal, it is estimated that 37 hours is required by a plan coordinator to prepare, as well as significant input from senior managers and other professionals. Improved performance would dramatically improve productivity as the time spent handling queries and complaints would reduce significantly.

In addition, there is insufficient capacity to attend annual EHC reviews, ensure robust scrutiny of the funded provision and to update all EHC plans following review, (except for those in the most vulnerable circumstances). As a result, most financial allocations are rolled-over to the following year rather than tight financial controls being enforced, cases that potentially could be closed are not, and review of transport arrangements is not considered holistically.

Without funding allocated to address the structural budget deficit and capacity issues described above, the service would have to reduce its staffing in order to make savings, resulting in a decline in the overall performance of the service. This would increase the gap between Warwickshire and the national average and statutory target. Furthermore, we would see an increase in complaints from families and schools regarding a lack of statutory provision.

Alternatively, the SENDAR service would retain its existing staffing establishment, resulting in an overspend which would have to be found from other parts of the Education & Learning Business Unit. Although the total budget for the Business Unit is £94m, £72m of this is funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant, and any savings here cannot be applied to revenue funded services. Of the revenue funded services, 70% of the budget relates to Home to School Transport, which has its own structural overspend to manage, plus a savings target of £1.6m over the next two years. Any savings to meet the £413k structural overspend on SENDAR would therefore have to be found from the residual £6.5m revenue budgets.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

There are two main assumptions:

- that demand for EHC plans will remain stable or increase
- that the staffing model is appropriate

Demand

The number of school age EHC plans has remained stable, with increases of less than 1% over the last three years. However, there has been a significant increase (7%) of the total number of EHC plans issued due to the extended age range, particularly at 16-25. Across England there has been an 8% rise in the total number of statements of SEN or EHC plans compared with 2015. Population growth will only add to the pressure.

In addition to the increase in EHC plans, there is also an increase in referrals for EHC plans. Between January and March 2017, 195 referrals were received for EHC plans, higher than any other quarter since the SEND reforms in September 2014. This represents a 43.4% increase on the number of referrals received in quarter 1 of 2016. Not all referrals will result in an EHC plan. In 2016, 36% of referrals resulted in a decision not to assess.

Staffing model

The SENDAR budget supports a staffing structure of 11.5fte Education, Health and Care (EHC) Plan Coordinators and 1.8fte Senior EHC Plan Coordinators. The service also has an administrative support function with a team of 9.2fte, and pays for the statutory Family Action PPS Service (also known as SENDIAS) which has an annual cost of £127,000.

The gap in the structural budget of £0.413 is the equivalent of a reduction of 8 EHC Plan Coordinators.

An exercise has been undertaken to compare service models and benchmark staffing capacity with other local authorities in the West Midlands. The service model of the best performing SENDAR services is based upon the same workforce as the Warwickshire model: plan coordinators with administrative support. Plan coordinators are expected to carry out the same tasks including coordinating professional advice, writing and issuing EHC plans and attending EHC review meetings. The service has similar quality assurance and monitoring arrangements to Warwickshire.

The exercise demonstrated that Warwickshire has the highest average number of EHC plans per Plan Coordinators (257) as well one of the highest administrative ratios of EHC plans to staff (443). The two best performing local authorities, with regard to issuing EHC plans within 20 weeks, averaged 106 and 118 EHC plans per Plan Coordinator and 278 and 162 EHC plans per administrative officer. The business case is based on evaluations from SEND inspection reporting a ratio maximum of 200 plans per Plan Coordinator.

Based upon best practice and the continued increase in EHC plans, the following staffing requirement is recommended:

Staffing	Future fte requirement	Difference to current position
Head of SENDAR & EPS	1	No change
Senior Plan coordinators	2.55	+0.77
Plan coordinators	17.86	+6.18
Business Support Manager	0.2	No change
Office Manager	1	No change
Panel Administrator	1	No change
Administrative Assistants	9.90	+2.82
Data and ICT Lead	0	-1.00
Finance Officer	1	No change
Total	31.81	+8.77

When considering current pressures on SENDAR it is worth considering that (with on-costs) the cost of a Plan Coordinator is approximately £50k per year. The cost of independent specialist provision ranges, but typically costs £60k - £70k per year. Currently Warwickshire has over 250 children and young people in independent specialist provision, a higher percentage than other local authorities. With sufficient time to co-produce EHC plans with the family, a plan coordinator will be able to promote the benefits of local state-funded provision (for example, a place at a SEND Resourced Provision which costs £18k per year) and avoid a costly place in independent specialist provision, transport and, in some cases, avoid a tribunal process.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

Funding will be used to:

- Maintain current permanent staffing in SENDAR (structural deficit)
- Increase staffing in SENDAR to address capacity issues and ensure statutory expectations and national targets are met
- Maintain existing commissions with Educational Psychology Service (statutory assessments and preparation for tribunals) and SENDIAS (independent information, advice and support).

As a result we would expect to see:

- A significant increase in EHC plans issued within 20 weeks of referral to above the national average, and reaching 90% target
- Attendance at EHC Plan reviews and as a consequence increased control of expenditure identified on EHC plans
- Improved satisfaction from families and schools, and a reduction in complaints and queries to SENDAR
- Confidence in preparation for Ofsted SEND inspection that robust arrangements are in place and statutory expectations are being met

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Pressures elsewhere in Education and Learning would mean that the SENDAR expenditure would have to be reduced (see above). Staffing cuts would need to be made in SENDAR, meaning that the local authority would be unable to meet statutory requirements and performance would get worse. Vulnerable communities (those with special educational needs and disabilities) would not be appropriately supported and access to quality learning would be reduced and delayed. It is possible that some reductions may be made to the SENDIAS contract in order to mitigate the impact, however this will depend on contract terms and conditions.

SEND is subject to inspection by Ofsted. Reduction to staffing capacity in SENDAR will also put the local authority at risk of being issued with a Statement of Action for insufficient arrangements for young people with SEND. Surrey report the additional financial cost of their Statement of Action (March 2017) has been 6m since April 2017 to date. In addition significant reputational damage and loss of trust among parents and communities.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

To date the budget pressure has been met from SEND Implementation Grant and budgets elsewhere within E&L, but from 2018/19 no further grant is available and other savings targets mean that there is no further capacity for support elsewhere within Education & Learning.

Expenditure	Current Budget 2017/18	2018/19 Structural Deficit Budget	2018/19 Budget to meet Statutory Requirement
Plan Coordinators	£ 635,000	£ 635,000	£ 1,091,000
Admin Support	£ 249,000	£ 249,000	£ 260,000
Transport	£ 5,000	£ 5,000	£ 8,000
SENDIAS (Family Action, PPS Service)	£ 127,000	£ 127,000	£ 127,000
SENDAR Commissioned Services	£ 150,000		£ 150,000
	£ 1,166,000	£ 1,016,000	£ 1,636,000
Income			
Corporate Funded Budget	£ 603,000	£ 603,000	£ 603,000
SEND Grant Funding	£ 370,000		£ -
HOS Budget	£ 193,000		£ -
	£ 1,166,000	£ 603,000	£ 603,000
Potential 2018/19 Deficit	£ -	£ 413,000	£ 1,033,000

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Transport & Economy
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Skills for Employment Project Extension

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	x	Over how many years is the funding required?	2
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	500	500

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Mark Ryder Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The funding is required to extend the work of the Skills for Employment programme for a further two years beyond the current end date of March 2018. The project has had a clear positive impact on the provision of careers support and employability skills by schools, colleges and businesses, and supported a large number of young people to access new and additional services. We have seen a significant improvement within the knowledge, understanding and dedicated capacity within schools and colleges on this agenda; and we are working with both businesses and the education sector as to how we can sustain this activity after the programme. A number of projects that have been supported in the past are now looking at alternative funding models (such as business sponsorship and parent contributions), which we believe could be explored and developed further. However, we believe with the current funding pressures facing the education sector, and an uncertain and changing policy environment, to finish the programme now would risk unravelling the progress made to date. Moreover, a two year extension would enable us to align activity within the new policy environment and further develop our work and progress on sustainability of investment and activity longer-term.

Reason for the Request

The time-limited funding allocated in the 2014/15 Budget Resolution to establish and implement the Skills for Employment Programme finishes in 2017/18. We forecast that by the end of March 2018, we will have spent £2.05m of the total £2.4m allocated. The remaining £350,000 is held in reserves to enable us to fund on-going commitments that the programme has entered into (predominantly to take advantage of leveraging external funding from the European Social Fund). Details of this are available if required. As such, the Skills for Employment Programme resources will be fully committed by the end of 2017/18, and no further new investments or interventions would be possible.

The programme has had significant impact and success to date. So far, 31,000 young people have benefitted from some form of employability skills/careers support, and over 500 businesses have engaged in the programme. With our further interventions planned this year, and our on-going future commitments, we anticipate that over 42,000 young people will benefit from the programme in total (at an average cost of £57 per student supported). This excludes the "career game" application that has been developed by one of our projects, and will be made available for use free of charge to all schools in the near future, which obviously has capacity to support many more pupils in due course. While hard to associate direct cause and effect, we have also seen a reduction in number of young people who are Not in Education, Employment & Training (NEET), an increase in the number staying on in education, and an increase in the number moving into employment with training (particularly apprenticeships).

A recent independent and objective evaluation of the programme (copy available if required) has identified the following key impacts:

- The programme has improved careers advice at 96% of schools surveyed (with three-quarters saying it had "vastly improved")

- There has been an increase in the number of schools who employ a careers advisor (up from 79% to 92%), and there was a 30% increase in the amount of time that staff members dedicated to delivering careers advice (up from 2.7 days to 3.5 a week)
- There was a 50% increase in the number of schools providing careers talks and work experience
- 54% of schools surveyed had made strong and lasting engagements with local businesses as a result of the programme
- Two-thirds of schools surveyed said that the activities supported through Skills for Employment had had a positive impact on wider school engagement by pupils.

However, the evaluation also showed that while the programme had significantly helped improve the *capability* of schools to undertake careers and employment related activity which require staff-time, their *capacity* to undertake more intensive activities such as one-to-one careers advice, staff training, projects with employers, co-development of the curriculum with businesses, and visits to HE/FE/Businesses are still dependent on external funding. With the current pressures on school finances, it is unlikely that these types of interventions would continue without further Skills for Employment funding.

Outside of the programme, there are a number of wider policy drivers that also both confirm the importance of maintaining investment for a couple more years, but also provide the foundations for longer-term sustainability and a clear legacy for the Skills for Employment programme. These are:

- New National Careers Strategy – expected to be published by the Government later this year, highlighting the importance of careers and employment support provision in schools. We do not yet know what this may mean in terms of additional requirements (or expectations) on schools, the focus of activity, and any additional funding implications. In this period of uncertainty and potential change, a reduction in the current core external support provided to schools to support this agenda could be quite damaging to the capacity within the sector to respond to this strategy.
- Careers & Enterprise Company – this was established nationally 2 years ago, and was therefore not in place when the original Skills for Employment Programme was conceived. There is an opportunity for stronger engagement and collaboration with the Careers & Enterprise Company, and it is also likely that this organisation will see a strengthening role and possibly further investment following the new National Careers Strategy.
- Provision of European Social Fund (ESF) – the region currently benefits from European Social Fund provision, supporting a number of projects to address social inclusion, unemployment and economic activity within Warwickshire, many with a particular focus on young people. Most of this provision ends in 2018, and could lead to a significant reduction in the availability of support for our young people. It is likely that a further round of funding for ESF will be available for the period 2019-2021, but much of this will require match funding.
- Changes to apprenticeships – recent changes to the system are affecting both supply and take-up at the moment, and businesses are struggling to understand how the new structure works. The changes present both an opportunity and a threat – if effectively directed and supported, it could lead to increased take-up, but it could also lead to less businesses engaged and lower provision if not careful.
- Increasing skills shortages - businesses continue to highlight skills shortages and difficulties with recruitment. Businesses are therefore increasingly looking for alternative ways of finding

labour, and links to schools, colleges and universities and use of apprenticeships will be critical in this and we are seeing a significant increase in interest recently.

- Brexit – this has the potential to exacerbate the skills shortages and recruitment problems being faced by businesses locally, particularly as Coventry & Warwickshire has one of the highest concentrations of non-UK workers of all LEP areas in the country. The importance of “growing your own talent” through links to local schools, colleges and universities will therefore become even more crucial in the coming years to mitigate against this potential risk.

A two year extension to the programme would therefore enable us to ensure continuity of the valuable investments that are being made to support schools & colleges on employability skills and careers advice; develop a strategic approach to supporting skills solutions and career routeways for young people in our priority sectors; and enable us to create a joint long-term plan for this agenda on the back of the new National Careers Strategy, evolution of the Careers & Enterprise Company, and any potential devolved or external funding streams.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

It is assumed that the current pressures on finance for schools continues for the next couple of years, limiting the amount of investment that they can make in the employability skills/careers support agenda.

It is assumed that the demand for labour, recruitment difficulties and skills shortages being highlighted by businesses over the past few years continues. We have seen an acceleration of the difficulties being faced in past year, and the Brexit discussions are at the moment exacerbating this.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

It is proposed that the funding would be used in three main ways:

1. Continuation of the successful small, match funded grants to schools & colleges to enable additional investment in employability skills and careers advice & support. This funding will help develop and grow the schools capability to undertake this sort of investment, following our earlier successes of developing their capacity.
2. Further supporting the development of activities/funding models that would help enable more sustainable investment into these areas (i.e. sponsorship of activities, use of donations, parent funding models, etc.)
3. Supporting the implementation of Sector Skills Plans, based around our priority sectors of: Advanced Manufacturing (inc. low carbon vehicles and Connected & Autonomous Vehicles), Digital & Creative Technologies; Health & Social Care; Professional Services; and Tourism & Culture. This will predominantly be grants and/or commissioned activity to help address

identified skills gaps in these key growing sectors; support effective youth transitions into these sectors with clear career routeways; and co-curricular development between businesses and schools/colleges/universities.

The funding will therefore maintain and further develop the capability and capacity within schools & colleges to address this agenda; help develop longer-term more sustainable funding models for activities requiring additional investment; and address skills shortages and future skill needs to support the continued growth of our economy. A key focus throughout our interventions will be on ensuring strong sustainability of activities within the new policy environment summarised above.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

The Skills for Employment Programme directly supports one of the two key objectives for the 2017-2020 OOP – namely that: “Warwickshire’s economy is vibrant and supported by the right jobs, training and skills and infrastructure”. More specifically, it helps deliver against a number of the identified priorities:

- Young people are supported to access apprenticeships and employment
- Warwickshire is an attractive place to do business with a strong local economy and infrastructure
- Our communities and businesses are thriving and prosperous.

Without funding, we would be unable to undertake any pro-active investment to support the delivery of employability skills and careers support. We would therefore be reliant on seeking to influence schools and colleges to utilise their own limited resources; and encouraging businesses to fully invest themselves in these activities. While we are likely to have some limited success with this given the increased capabilities we have created within the education sector, and increased awareness by business of the benefits of developing partnerships with schools/colleges, this will be significantly below the potential we believe is possible and is in danger of slipping backwards without a sustained investment push at this point, given the wider difficulties, uncertainties and changing policy environment.

The consequences of this will be fewer young people making successful transitions into employment, training and apprenticeships within the local area (NB: the lifetime cost to the public purse of a young person becoming NEET is estimated to be £70,240); young people making poor and ill-informed decisions on future training and unemployment (leading to higher job-churn and under-utilisation of skills); less engaged young people in learning leading to potentially lower educational outcomes; businesses continuing to face skills shortages and finding it hard to recruit, reducing the attractiveness and competitiveness of Warwickshire’s economy (which could ultimately lead to businesses leaving the area, or investing elsewhere, thus reducing our level of business activity, employment and business rates income – which could have a direct impact on the future income base of Warwickshire County Council).

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

See attached budget.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Community Services
----------------------	--------------------

Title
Timebanking In Warwickshire

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	x	Over how many years is the funding required?	2
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	45	45

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Phil Evans Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

£90,000 requested to deliver a two year pilot 'TimeBanking' Project, as described to Corporate Board on 5th September 2017.

Time Banks are community based initiatives, which provide a means of exchange, whereby units of time act as the currency. This proposal relates to establishing a timebank, using the approach advocated and supported by specialists in the field.

Reason for the Request

To support the growth of the volunteering economy within Warwickshire, as a part of the Community Capacity Transformation Programme.

Whilst there is widespread support for the establishment of a Timebank within Warwickshire, there is currently no resource available to deliver.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

Should the pilot be successful, particularly in supporting corporate transformation projects, then the ongoing costs relating to the scheme will be redirected from existing budgets.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

1 x Time Broker and on costs – c£35,000 per year
Specialist support for Timebank Model – c£5,000 per year
Running costs – c£5,000 per year

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Employment of full time 'Time Broker'
Securing specialist support for Time Bank model
Set up and running costs

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Based upon research on existing schemes operated elsewhere.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Community Services
----------------------	--------------------

Title
Waste Management Budget Pressures

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of Rugby BC increase disposal and housing growth pressure	643	825

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Phil Evans Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Liz Firmstone Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The spending need is comprised of 3 elements:

- A collection authority changed their waste collection service, which has placed a significant extra cost burden on our disposal arrangements.
- A large increase in housing growth of some 2,500 new homes, increasing the level of waste material needing to be processed.
- There has been a much larger increase in contractual costs than the inflationary allocation given as part of the revenue budget settlement rendering it totally inadequate to cover the costs.

Reason for the Request

A collection authority changing their collection service, which has placed a significant extra cost burden on disposal arrangements:

At the beginning of 2017/18, Rugby BC resolved to start charging its residents for the collection of green waste at the kerbside. This has resulted in 45% of their residents signing up to the service (60% of the overall material). The result is that more of the material is entering the general waste stream and therefore putting extra pressure on our disposal costs. In addition, we are now no longer able to put their residual waste through Coventry Energy from Waste facility and have therefore diverted all of their material to landfill as the level of the increased green waste would take waste over the permitted NOx level within their site permit. Whilst we have adjusted waste disposal routes for other collection authorities (to mitigate the overall cost) this has greatly increased our costs by £321,612

A large increase in housing growth has increased the level of waste material needing to be processed:

In the past year, we have been subject to the fastest housing growth across the country, with 2,550 extra homes being built. For each new property we see an average 1.07 tonnes per annum, resulting in an extra 2,728 tonnes per annum having to be processed. Based on our present recycling performance, this has still resulted in an extra cost of £182,287 per annum

Larger increases in contractual costs than the inflationary allocation that was given as part of the revenue budget settlement:

On top of the last two key pressures, the 2017/18 inflation allowance was greatly reduced compared to the indexation that we incurred with our contracts; the statutory recycling credits inflation we have to pay at 3%; and the statutory landfill tax costs. The difference between what we received and have had to pay is £139,092.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

We have used data from the past 12 months to forecast the increased costs of sending Rugby BC waste material to landfill instead of energy to waste (gate price difference), and the increase in waste levels by including the green waste within the black wheeled bins as not all of Rugby's residents will pay for the service.

Breakdown of increased costs in respect of Rugby BC changing the waste collection service:

1) Increased waste in residual wheeled bin	£258,912
2) Increased waste diverted to landfill	£247,941
3) Increased green waste at HWRC's	£45,592
Total	£552,445
4) Decrease in green waste to Ufton IVC	£230,833
Overall increase cost	£321,612

With regard to the housing growth, we have taken the government's annual housing growth statistics across our county, and then used a formula to come to a unit cost for processing both the recycling element and the disposal costs of each household.

Inflation given in 2017/18 budget settlement for our statutory costs i.e Recycling Credits and associated contractual indexation costs was well below our contracted obligations resulting in a shortfall of 46% of the inflationary figure.

Overall the budget pressure will continue to the end and beyond the end of the OOP 2020 targets

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

All the funding will be used to offset the increased costs for the three elements outlined, allowing the service to continue to meet its other saving obligations

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If the funding was not approved, the authority would have to look at increasing the present savings programme by implementing new policies. This could include putting back proposals like closing a number of Household Waste Recycling Centres and charging for disposal of all DIY material by residents

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

--

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Child Sexual Exploitation, Missing Children and Trafficking Team.

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	167	167

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

Requirement to improve response and performance in relation to incidents of missing children to meet statutory duties:

3.5 FTE Missing Children's Practitioners

1 FTE CSE, Missing and Trafficking Co-Ordinator. Total £166,800 per year.

Reason for the Request

The CSE, Missing and Trafficking Team in Autumn 2016 completed a review of its service.

MCPs

In the past funding for missing children's teams came from underspends in Social Work teams. As the Social Work teams now require their full staffing quotient, this way of funding the current 3.5 FTE MCPs is no longer available as there has been a resulting financial pressure to be addressed from 1st April 2017. Note that the current 3.5 FTE MCPs are currently on temporary contracts in recognition of the need to identify a more sustainable funding source to provide the service.

Missing & Trafficking Coordinator

The WCC safeguarding children's Board has recognised a gap in the response to trafficking. This additional role would take a lead around child trafficking on behalf of WCC.

- We really need to invest in this emerging area of work, to support practitioners to recognise all types of trafficking, work with unaccompanied children from abroad when they arrive to help them recognise they are being trafficked, avoid them going missing and experiencing abuse, forced labour or modern slavery.
- In Warwickshire to date we have a cumulative list of 20 children who arrived in Warwickshire as unaccompanied from abroad and who went missing immediately. There is evidence they have been trafficked. For example one young person who was first found in a lorry in Warwickshire, was found earlier this year in Manchester locked in a cannabis factory.

This role is also responsible for bringing together each of the agencies to ensure an effective and co-ordinated approach is taken, ensuring proper coordination - ensuring we are sustaining a robust and positive service across all agencies.

This funding will allow us to meet our statutory obligations and meet the recommendations of the review:

- To increase the number of Missing Children's Practitioners in order to reduce the number of missing episodes. This recommendation would be achieved by appointing 3.5 permanent MCPs rather than having the current temporary contracts.
- To meet our statutory requirement for all children who go missing to receive a Return Home Interview (RHI) . This statutory requirement was not being met. Until September 2016 just 50% of children going missing received a return home interview. This gathers evidence from young people around their experiences while they were missing, which often include suffering exploitation such as sexual and physical abuse, substance misuse, drug dealing, forced labour

and child trafficking

- The review highlighted that the WCC CSE, Missing and Trafficking Team are the only team within the Midlands (indeed only team nationally as far as we are aware) who do not have a Co-Ordinator post within the Local Authority.

In October 2016 the additional 3.5 Missing Children's Practitioners (MCP's) were recruited.

This also addressed internal concerns and concerns of partners in police and Barnardo's who had raised their concerns at senior officer level.

Permanent funding for these posts will ensure sustainability.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

3.5 FTE Missing Children's Practitioners (£34,514 each) and 1 FTE CSE, Missing and Trafficking Co-Ordinator (£46,000). Total £166,800 per year. Demand regarding missing children and children who are exploited and trafficked will remain.

- That targets for reduction in children looked after will be met.
- The team will set a target to reduce the number of missing children and missing episodes by 40% by 2020. As this target is achieved full and regular reviews will be undertaken of the service to consider a reduction in staffing. Such a reduction will need to be measured and occur over time to ensure demand continues to reduce.
- When the target for reducing CLA is met more children will be at home. This may mean that MCP's are still required to keep children at home and support them to remain out of care or it may mean that there are less missing children. This requires further understanding and research to ensure any reduction of intervention with missing children does not lead to an increase in missing episodes or increase in children looked after.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

- Ensure that the staffing levels required to meet demands of missing children are maintained through permanent funding. Ensure all children who go missing are provided with a return home interview.
- The team will set a target to reduce missing children and missing episodes by 40% by 2020.
- Enable a move to co-ordinated support being triggered at 3 missing episodes in 90 days rather than 5 plus missing episodes in 90 days which is currently being provided.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

- Children would be less safe in Warwickshire as missing episodes for our most vulnerable children, particularly children looked after would increase.

- All agencies would be exposed to the cost of a missing child - significant for all agencies. The University of Portsmouth (2016) applied the cost of every missing episode as £2,415 for the police. The cost to other agencies was not counted but is known to be significant. Just for the top 20 children the cumulative cost would be over 1.8 million pounds on the number of episodes. If a 50% reduction over three months in episodes had not been achieved the cost would have been over 2.7 million, almost a million pounds more in just three months.
- Without funding for these posts and intervention it would not be possible to sustain the following outcomes and young people's missing episodes are likely to continue to increase, at increased cost.
 - All children being offered proactively offered a return home interview. Within the first month of the new practitioners being in post 90% of children who engaged in an interview.
 - Performance remaining high: A review in July 2017 of the top 20 young people who went missing found there were 750 missing episodes to date between the top 20.
 - OFSTED inspection recently highlighted excellent work around CSE, Missing and Trafficking. One of the key areas they were impressed by was the swift and child centred approach taken to meet young people after a missing episode. If this temporary recruitment had not been completed in November 2016, this area of work is likely to have received significant criticism from OFSTED.
 - Reductions in missing episodes seen in 98% of the top 20 children who go missing.
 - In addition information from young people has informed sexual exploitation operations
- Patterns within the local profile are now better understood and addressed. Warwickshire County Council would be likely to be exposed to significant reputational damage and could be seen to be failing its corporate parental responsibilities.
-
- The lack of a Co-ordinator post puts us significantly behind our counterparts, will impact on the ability to understand and address the local profile. Trafficking of children will remain an area of concern and is likely to increase without a resource to lead this area of work.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Upon the current mid-point salary + oncosts for posts 2017/18.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children and Families
----------------------	-----------------------

Title
Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) Service

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	47	47

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The additional spending need equates to :

1 additional 18.5 hours of a Local Authority Designated Officer post (Grade O) - at £25,468

1 FTE minute taker (Grade E) - at £21,588 to undertake the minutes of a "Position of Trust" meeting (please refer to the information in the next section.)

Reason for the Request

The LADO is responsible in accordance with statutory guidance for overseeing the management of allegations against adults who work in a position of trust with children. This includes allegations against staff or volunteers who work in statutory, voluntary or independent sector organisations in Warwickshire.

The OFSTED inspection of children services in May 2017 found that "Designated officer arrangements for the management of allegations against professionals are insufficiently robust, and, as a result, interventions have not always been timely."

This finding related to the high volume of work which is not consistently responded to in a timely manner due to competing demands. The additional staffing resources are critical to enable workloads to be more effectively managed.

When a LADO receives a referral they will make a number of enquiries to establish the degree and nature of the harm posed to a child or children. In some instances this may involve the convening and chairing of multi-agency "Position of Trust" meetings which share information and formulate plans to manage the member of staff and safeguard children.

Such meetings need to be formally convened and standard practice requires minutes to be formulated and distributed because this provides a clear audit and evidence trail and some of these may eventually be required for criminal/ legal proceedings. Currently there are no formal arrangements in place for minutes to be taken and distributed by the service. These tasks are dispersed among a range of administrators and the result is frequent inconsistencies and delays as well as variations in practice.

In order to appropriately respond to OfStED 's inspection and for the service to meet statutory responsibilities and operational demands, the current establishment is insufficient.

A review of the service identified that the additional resources are required in order to be able to meet workload demands.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

In preparing the submission, it has been assumed that the workload demands will be contained within this proposed staffing structure. Demand is currently rising and there is a risk that as confidence of partners and agencies continues to grow in the LADO services, workload demand could continue to increase.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will be used to fund additional staffing resources to meet demand and OFSTED requirements/recommendations.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If the funding was not provided we would be unable to meet the current and rising demands resulting from more referrals.

The confidence that has been built up among agencies and professionals that consult with it would be undermined.

This would impact upon the ability to deliver a safe service to safeguard the needs of Warwickshire children and would present a reputational risk to WCC and failure to address issues identified in May 2017 OfStED Inspection.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

The cost has been calculated on the costs of the posts at mid-point plus oncosts.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
School Transport for Looked After Children

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate) (£,000)			
Permanent	200	This represents the current ongoing overspend	
One-off Estimate:	240	This is for the period from Sept 1 st 2015 to 31 st March 2018.	
Permanent	125	As a result of the judgement there may be an ongoing additional pressure. Alternative solutions are being investigated and will be subject to consultation	

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure: Permanent - known	200	200
Cost of pressure: Permanent – current estimated max	125	125
One off estimate	240	
Total	565	325

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, ● Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and ● Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off

I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood

Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017

Description of the Additional Spending Need

There is an ongoing pressure on the school transport budget for Children Looked After which is part of wider transport issues across the County Council where WCC has not been able to reduce expenditure. The ongoing pressure relates to an original transport savings target from 2014 that has not been achievable. £600k was addressed through alternative savings plans. However this has not been able to address an additional pressure on this budget of £200k which has remained as an overspend into 2017/18.

In addition, the Local Government Ombudsman has found the Local Authority is acting unlawfully in the way it is remunerating our Foster Carers for school transport for children who are eligible for free school transport and has determined that in future all entitled children aged 4 years to 16 years should receive school transport and that transport costs should not be met from Foster Carer allowances. Furthermore the Local Authority is being required to back-date any requests to 2015 where Foster Carers feel they are out of pocket as a result of school transporting.

Reason for the Request

There are three elements to this pressure:

- (i) To address the known permanent budget shortfall of £200k per annum.
- (ii) To address the ongoing permanent requirement from 1st April arising from the Local Government Ombudsman judgement that there will potentially be more children who will be eligible to free school transport.
- (iii) To meet the estimated cost of back payments to Foster Carers who will make a claim from September 2015 onwards. This is reflected by an estimated one-off request above.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

Assumptions are:

1. The time-limited request for back payment to Foster Carers is an outline but realistic estimate.

This is because until we write to Foster Carers to let them know they can make a claim from 2015 it is difficult to determine the number of those children under 8 who have had to be transported more than 2 miles and those children over eight who have had to be transported more than 3 miles. WCC's assumption is that these payments will be back-dated to September 2015 (start of academic year).

2. That we will change the system for reimbursing Foster Carers from April 2018 in line with the legal requirements and the LGO judgement.
3. That between September 2017 and April 2018 details of the system to be applied will be developed
4. The need for assistance with school transport will remain at the current level, in recognition of having to balance budgetary consideration with the need for Children Looked After to retain continuity at school despite the distance they need to travel.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will be used

- (i) Towards the CLA School Transport budget
- (ii) For reimbursement to Foster Carers

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If this was not funded this would increase the financial pressure within the Business Unit.

If this was not funded it could affect Foster Carer confidence in the Authority

If there is financial pressure on Foster Carers this could have a detrimental effect on Foster Carer recruitment, which is a key strategy for the delivery of 2020 OOPs (Ref: CF06)

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

. This cost has been based on:

- current budget spend predictions
- information from Insight team
- Historical claims.

It is recommended that further work is carried out to assess the financial impact of likely ongoing costs of the Ombudsman decision and also the impact of the backdated payment. The outcome of this analysis can be brought to the November MTFP discussions. In the meantime, please consider the figures presented in this report as broad estimates based on assumptions which require further consideration.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Annual Health Charge for the cost of Medical Advice relating to adoption & Special Guardianship Orders (SGOs) Health Assessment

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure: Medical Advisor Fees (invoice received)	58	58
Health Assessments : For Prospective Special Guardians (maximum estimate)	25	25
Total	83	83

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood

Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017

Description of the Additional Spending Need

Local Authorities have a statutory duty to seek health information in relation to adoptive parents and the matches between adoptive parents and children. The most recent advice by the Department of Health and NHS England is that CCGs have a right to require the Local Authority to fund certain activities that were previously funded by the CCGs. Our local CCGs are now exercising that right, creating this cost pressure. WCC has contested this unsuccessfully.

There are 2 elements:

1. To fund services of Medical Advisor as required under the adoption legislation. The Medical Advisor reviews the health reports with adoption and assesses parental health and prepares a report. (The Medical Advisor can also be a member of the adoption panel).
The CCG have determined upon advice from the Department of Health that the cost is payable by the Local Authority and have invoiced WCC for the annual costs for 2017/18
2. There is a requirement to have full Health Assessments completed on prospective Special Guardians for children who are Looked After and. Medical Advisor's views are sought on the content of the health assessments.

Reason for the Request

Updated guidance and review of current practice in relation to SGO medicals which are increasingly being challenged within the courts.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

In relation to 1. above: The assumption is that the CCG will continue to ask Local Authority to take responsibility for paying for this.

In relation to 2. Above: The assumption is that the Local Authority will need to meet this cost in order to avoid the risk of legal challenge in regard to SGO applications.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will be used to commission the services of a Medical Advisor and to commission General Practitioners to complete Health Assessments for prospective Special Guardianships using the appropriate detailed documentation (known as CORAM-BAAF).

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If not funded, this would remain a continuing pressure.

If practice has not improved regarding Health Assessment of Special Guardians then there is a possibility that permanency for children on SGO's could not be assured in the event that the carer has ongoing health issues.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

The cost has been calculated based on levels of historic demand for Medical Advisor activity represented by an invoice already raised by health to the value of £58k and by estimating the number of SGO Health Assessments completed at an average cost of £250 per assessment.

The second element of this bid is an estimate and represents the maximum likely cost in this area.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Adoption Service and the development of the Regional Adoption Agency (ACE)

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	X	Over how many years is the funding required?	2
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure: Loss of central government grant to purchase placements for "hard to place" children" and failure to achieve the budgeted total income from selling of places	204	204
Potential Cost of pressure: To accept a higher unit cost as the RAA is being established		94
Total	204	298

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 15.09.17</p>

Finance sign off

I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood

Date of Sign Off: 15.09.17

Description of the Additional Spending Need

In 2017/18 a budget pressure exists in the Adoption Service. This is a result of the withdrawal of the Hard to Place grant previously made available to local authorities to purchase placements for children and the income target for inter-agency placements being unachievable. There has been a reduction in the number of placements made outside of Warwickshire which has partly mitigated this pressure.

The hard to place grant which has over the last 3 years enabled LAs to claim back fees for the purchase of adoption placements for children from other LAs came to an end on 31 March 2017. This means that WCC now has to fund placements for these children where we are unable to recruit our own adopters within reasonable timescales for children with specific and complex needs.

2018/19 onwards:

In addition, going forward there is a national mandate to become part of a Regional Adoption Agency and Warwickshire County Council will be the host for Adoption Central England (ACE) for Warwickshire, Coventry, Solihull and Worcestershire.

Each partner authority will contribute into ACE from 2018/19 onwards and the current agreed contributions by each LA are established on an 'As Is' position which is based on the following:

1. The agreed current staffing establishment for each LA
2. An estimate of direct operational (non-staffing costs) costs for each LA – based on 2 – 3 year average spend
3. For the “purchasing and selling” of inter- agency Adoption places the average activity and hence spend was been used over the past 2-3 years.

The estimated overspend for arising from the loss in Central Government grant and the pressure from inter-agency placements is estimated to be £204k, as it has to be assumed that a certain number of placements for children will be made outside/ purchased by ACE.

ACE requires an inter-agency budget in order to make placements outside of ACE where we are unable to recruit our own adopters within reasonable timescales for children with specific and complex needs. The cost per child is set nationally at £27k. The inter-agency budget has 2 components (a) expenditure for where placements are made outside/ paid for from ACE and (b) income for where placements are sold by ACE. On balance expenditure is expected to be greater than income so the inter-agency budget is a net expenditure budget.

The current agreed 'As is' model for ACE predicates that each local authority will contribute their

average spend over the last 2 – 3 years as a contribution to the ACE budget and that this budget assumption and average CLA adopted activity also form the basis for the unit cost. This includes “Hard to Place” place purchasing activity (and expenditure) that was previously funded by the central government grant calculations..

There is therefore a recurring estimated shortfall of £204,000 until spend activity changes as a result of the planned efficiencies that the ACE will bring and a reduction in the number of net placements made outside of the ACE.

It has been agreed that all partners will work together to bringing the unit cost towards the current WCC levels from Year 2 of operation. Based on current RAA modelling as agreed with partners, the arising pressure of the higher unit costs for WCC in Year 2 is estimated to be an additional £94k.

Reason for the Request

ACE modelling has demonstrated that WCC currently has the lowest unit cost in the region. The RAA aims to reduce the overall unit cost across the ACE area. In the meantime however, pressures will exist in 2018/19 and 2019/20 as detailed in this paper.

1. The pressure has arisen due to the loss of the “hard to place” grant and an unrealistic income target for the service. . The “hard to place” grant was centrally government funded which paid the LA for the costs of purchasing adoption places (either from other LA’s or Voluntary Adoption agencies). In order to continue to place children in a timely way and avoid delays in the looked after system, Warwickshire needs to continue to purchase placements from other agencies. All partners also agreed that ACE would need to continue to purchase these placements in order to get the best outcomes for the cohort of children suitable and wanting adoption, although this will be mitigated in future years by the pooling of resources.
2. In addition, there is a pressure arising from the ACE unit cost being estimated to be greater than Warwickshire’s current unit cost.

It is anticipated that the budget pressures will be reduced by 2020/21, by evolving to a successful practice of placing more children within the ACE region thereby reducing the payment of inter-agency fees and by a reduction in overall unit costs across the Agency.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

The current assumptions within the ACE business, operational and financial modelling are:

- (i) The need to continue to purchase Hard to Place adoption places will continue along the lines of the numbers averaged for the past 2 years.
- (ii) Over time the efficiencies of the RAA will mean less of a need to purchase these places externally and the majority will be within the ACE itself.

- (iii) The operational unit costs of the ACE will reduce from the current average unit cost to the WCC average cost.
- (iv) As the regional adoption hub becomes established it will provide further efficiencies and /or greater outcomes for the cohort of children.
- (v) Activity and trends will continue along the same trajectories as the last 2-3 financial years on which the current modelling for ACE has been based and on which the 4 LA contributions are based.
- (vi) That it is appropriate for the ACE to receive contributions based on the 'As Is' model and if this results in a total inter-agency net expenditure budget that is higher than required in a financial year that the agreement will have suitable provisions for its investment, carry forward and/or return to contributor.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will be used to invest in ACE Adoption Services to cover the range of services and provision currently available. It will ensure there is no financial barrier to planning and speeding the process for adoptive parents even if on an interagency basis.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If the funding is not provided a pressure within Adoption Services within Children and Families will exist. This is the case whether or not the authority proceeds with its ACE partnership arrangements. To not fund the ACE appropriately could pose a credibility issue for ACE and may result in a review of the service specification.

If funding was not available to support interagency places the longer term costs would remain higher in Foster Care and positive outcomes for children may be assured to the same extent.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

The financial working group of ACE has calculated the cost pressures based upon the current financial and performance data.

It is recommended that further work is carried out to review the assumptions listed above, the impact and contributions of partners, and the likely activity and financial cost to WCC over the next couple of years. The outcome of this should be brought to the MTFP November discussions.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
The Children's Social Work Act 2017 – Extension of Duties to Care Leavers

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)		
Permanent	x	The Act Received Royal Assent on 27 th April. This is subject to the duty being enforced from April 2018 and subject to no New Burdens funding being received.
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?
One-off		

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Potential Pressure arising from New Burdens	281	281

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The Children's Social Work Act 2017 requires the Local Authority to provide a Personal Advisor service for Care Leavers up to the age of 25 years.

This is a new requirement; previously this service was available up to the age of 21 years. This service must also to be provided to Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children & Young People.

A matter before Judicial Review at the current time has also highlighted the need for a Social Worker to complete the Pathway Plan for Care Leavers aged 18- 25 years rather than this being the responsibility of a Personal Advisor.

New Burdens money will be sought first and if this is not available this would be a funding pressure. This new requirement is likely to come into force from April 2018. This age extension puts the most pressure on Social Worker capacity as the numbers eligible for a Pathway Plan increase and on Personal Advisors, who are providing the on-going support required.

Reason for the Request

To deliver the new duties funding would be required to enhance staffing within the Leaving Care service. The appointment of 3 FTE Social Workers to be responsible for Pathway Plans plus the appointment of 5 Personal Advisors who will be responsible for providing the on-going support to Care Leavers.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

This request has been prepared based on the current number of care leavers in receipt of a service who are entitled to a minimum of 2 Pathway Plans per year (and more if there is significant change in their circumstances).

Based on current numbers this would be 600 Pathway Plans per year, each taking a full day to complete. Given that responsibility will be extending to young people up to 25 years it would be prudent to plan for a further post, making a total of 3 FTE Social Workers to work exclusively in this area

Legal advice has confirmed that the case law is very specific that this has to be a Social Worker Work is currently underway to calculate the number of Personal Assistants required to meet our responsibility to up to 25 years; the forecast of 5 is based on current workload capacity and current projected need.

Other assumptions are that

- (i) This will be required from April 2018 and will involve additional burdens and therefore additional costs as outlined here.
- (ii) We will have more information and guidance by April 2018.

There is currently no indication of money or capacity from anywhere else that will enable us to respond to this pressure.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

To support increased staffing capacity in the light of requirements

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

We would not meet the legal requirement to uphold the Act and there may be the risk of legal challenge
Without the additional resource it is likely that reported performance may deteriorate.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

This is based on the per annum cost of 3 Social Workers (including oncosts) and 5 Personal Assistants (including oncosts)
This will be subject to further confirmation from Central Government regarding New Burdens Funding.
We expect Guidance to be published in April 2018.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Priority Families & Family Support

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	X	Over how many years is the funding required?	2 years
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Priority Families county council funding withdrawn at end of 2017/18 - cost of pressure	425	425
Family and Parenting service – county council funding withdrawn at end of 2017/18 – cost of pressure	300	300
Total	725	725

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood

Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The funding pressure outlined is in relation to 2 areas:

- The fall out of County Council contribution to priority family funding for 2018/19 and 2019/20
- The discontinuation of time limited transition funding for 12 0-5 Family Support Workers at the end of 2017/18 (£0.3m pa)

The Priority Family Service and the Family and Parenting Service are intrinsically linked with regard to the Family Support offer and are therefore being considered together to provide the overall context.

The Priority Families Service

The service operates from 3 main funding streams:

- a) A £0.425m time limited County Council budget – currently 2017/18 is the final year.
- b) A DCLG grant which is part Payment by Results and hence variable (PbR – including an initial attachment fee and an outcome payment) and part block funding. The grant is reducing and will end March 2020.
- c) Drawdown of PFP earmarked reserves accumulated from phase 1 of the scheme when attachment fees were significantly higher to provide initial pump priming.

The County Council funding for the programme is only committed up to 2017/18. Nationally the government is committed to March 2020. In order not to overspend, staffing costs would need to reduce from their current position by £0.379m for 2018/19 and £1.450m for 2019/20 (see Tables 1 and 2 on page 4).

Without a further budget commitment from the County Council, Priority Families would only be able to afford to fund Early Help Officer support and 4 Family Support Workers by 19/20. However reduced capacity would also have an impact on our ability to achieve the level of PbR results that we are currently claiming for evidencing the 'turnaround' of families.

Even with the commitment of the Council to continue the current £0.425m funding for the last 2 years of programme, there would still need to be substantial reductions in the service delivery costs in the final year.

The advantages of continuing £0.425m for a further 2 years are:-

- It gives further time to further explore long term mainstreaming of the service including the opportunity to approach partners for contributions.

- Continuance will mean that we are better placed to maximise remaining income that is available from Central Government via PbR generation
- Crucially (and this demonstrates the overlap with 0-5 Redesign) an extra year may allow us to bring the Children Centre's family support workers (FSW's) in house (subject to the current consultation) and via redesign exploit efficiencies of scale via the redesign of the service under our One Team principles.

The Family & Parenting Service

This service is currently funded by a variety of sources, approximately 75% of which are time limited or subject to annual review. The total current recurrent Council budget for the service totals £0.994m of the £3.966m total budget. Within this, £0.3m is a time limited budget which currently supports the costs of 12 x 0-5's Family Support Workers and is due to cease at the end of 2017/18.

Continued funding for the Family Support Workers for a further 2 years would have an enabling impact on the delivery of the new Family Hub model under the 0-5 redesign. Otherwise a number of staff contracts would end at the same time as the 0-5 redesign is being implemented.

Reason for the Request

Priority Families:

Table 1. below outlines the financial situation with the ceasing of the time-limited funding.

Table 2. Shows the position with a continued funding of £425k

Family & Parenting Service:

Table 3. indicates that for the Family & Parenting Service, that of a gross budget of £3,956M only £0.994 is recurring core budget and indicates the £300k time-limited funding.

The reasons for the request for additional funding are as follows:

- WCC's funding for Family Support Services are largely based on timelimited and one-off monies. A number of funding streams are coming to an end and previous funding is no longer available. The funding requested would put the service on a sustainable footing and allow intervention at a level below the social care thresholds to be sustained, to avoid escalation into higher tiers of intervention.
- Family support workers are critical to delivery of new Family Hub model (0-5 redesign) and build on the successful Smart Start model.
- This funding would allow an additional transition time to establish an all age Family Support Service, including Commissioned Family Support Workers currently based in Children Centres (subject to the current 0-5 consultation) and exploit efficiencies of scale
- This funding would retain the opportunity to maximise remaining income that is available from Central Government via PbR generation

Table 1 Priority Families	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
	£000	£000	£000
SLAs (service delivery costs)	1641	1641	1641
Central Team	289	289	289
Grant total	-1192	-1051	-350
PFP reserves	-313	-500	-130
WCC budget	-425	0	0
Total	0	379 shortfall	1450 shortfall

Table 2 Priority Families	2018/19	2019/20
	£000	£000
SLAs (service delivery costs)	1641	1641
Central Team	289	289
Grant total	-1051	-350
PFP reserves	-500	-130
WCC budget continued	-425	-425
Total	-46 headroom	1025 shortfall

Table 3. Family & Parenting Service								
£000	Net Budget of the Service			Income from outside the service				
	Core Budget	Time Limited Core*	DSG Budget	DSG Income	External Income	0-5 (Smart Start)	Priority Families	Total
Total	994	300	656	227	67	258	1,454	3,956

*Transitional funding agreed within the 16/17 budget for a 2-year period

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

It is assumed that even with commitment to £425k funding for the last two years of the Priority Family programme there will still need to be substantial reductions in the Service Delivery costs in the final year.

Each Family Support Worker cost plus on-costs is assumed at £35k

It is assumed that removal of £300k funding for Family Support workers would have an impact on the continued availability of Family Support workers to deliver the new Family Hub model under the 0-5 service the redesign.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

This funding would be used to fund Family Support Workers and to build on a successful model

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Lack of resources to provide lower levels interventions to avoid escalation to social care involvement. Cases are likely to have to remain open to social workers for longer if opportunities to safely de-escalate are limited.

Priority Families would only be able to afford to fund an Early Help Officer support and 4 Family Support Workers (a reduction of 26 compared to current levels) by 2019/20.

There would be an rise in the average family caseload per FSW

There would be a reduction in the support available to the Early Help network in initiating and training then in CAF.

There would be less support for brokering so that families get the right help at the right time introducing risk to outcomes.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

This has been detailed in the briefing note to Corporate Board of 16th August 2017, *Family Support Pressures & Children's Centres Redesign*.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children and Families
----------------------	-----------------------

Title
Specialist Equipment For Children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	125	125

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need
Disabled Children's Equipment rental cost.

Reason for the Request

There has been an increase both in volume and spend for non-stock equipment. Information would suggest that more expensive non-standard equipment is being used to support an increased number of children with complex needs living in the community. There is a proposed review in relation to the issue of non-standard equipment to children who are now surviving longer due to improved care. There has also been an increase in population and there is an ongoing potential increase of families moving into the area; this will mean an increase in children with significant disability requiring specialist equipment. Equipment enables children and young people with SEND to remain at home and to access local education and health services. This then in turn prevents increased costs associated with alternative care.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

That demand/cost increases, as displayed over the first third of this financial year (2017/18), will continue.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

Funding will enable the continued provision of specialist equipment to meet assessed need, enabling children's needs to be met within the community.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

It is likely that children's needs would not be met within their home environments and care would become more difficult. The predicted outcome of this would be an increased pressure for alternative care which may increase the children looked after population amongst children with disabilities. Such children going into CLA care are inherently more expensive to place – with an average Net direct placement cost of £62,000 per year.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

The current budget is £125k but the actual forecasted spend is £257k
The pressure requested in this paper represents the difference between budget and forecast actual.
The cost has been calculated from the actual spend figures from April 2017 through to July 2017 which total £85,796. The actual forecasted spend for the 2017/18 financial year is £257,388.

Further work is being carried out to improve understanding of the cost drivers that have resulted in increases to expenditure and to assess whether this is likely to be an ongoing pressure or represents a one-off change in patterns. The outcome of this analysis will be brought to the November MTFP discussions and will include consideration of potential measures to mitigate the risk because it is highly likely that a significant pressure will arise. In the meantime, please consider the figures presented in this report as broad estimates based on assumptions which require further consideration.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Children & Families
----------------------	---------------------

Title
Family Group Conferencing

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	146	146

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Beate Wagner Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Purnima Sherwood Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The need is to develop the Family Group Conferencing service by funding a further 3 x Family Group Conference co-ordinators at a cost of £48.7k each pa including oncosts.

The service has recently undertaken a Smart Start funding project and this evidenced impact in reducing the number of children entering care and a resultant reduction in cost.

The service aims to fully engage and involve entire families in making safe plans for a child or children with identified concerns. There is currently a pilot which has Family Group Conference Co-ordinators co-located with Children Social Care teams in the Nuneaton and Bedworth area. By being collocated with the Children's teams and engaging with colleagues on the family issues on a day to day basis they have successfully worked with families where there is a child or children aged 0-5 who were either becoming Looked After or at risk of becoming Looked After. It has shown to be able avoid children becoming Looked After or for the length of them being Looked After to be curtailed by proactively involving extended families in taking the lead in shaping the plans for the child. .

Reason for the Request

Evaluation of the Smart Start project demonstrated a reduction in CLA giving a financial return greater than the investment made. This request seeks to develop and do more to increase the benefits and to reduce further the number of Children Looked After. The intention is to widen the age range and cover the whole of the County.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

It is assumed there will be no funding from elsewhere either locally or nationally from 2018/19 onwards.

The role of Family Group Conferencing will provide particularly important mechanism to ensure families take a proactive part in keeping children safe and that this approach is embedded across all parts of the Business unit. This will support the drive to reduce the need for children to become or remain looked after.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

To recruit 3 coordinators and so develop the service across the county

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Family Group Conferencing has led to significant financial savings proving a good return on investment and offering sustainability for the future

If this funding is not provided we are unable to develop the service further and unable to build on the learning and achievement from the Smart Start project and extend across the age ranges..

If this was not funded the learning and success of last year in keeping children out of care would not be developed to the same level:

- More children would go into care: The current service avoided 18 children going into care (in Q1 only) – assuming a 'low cost' care scenario for each of these children, the **estimated saving would be £596,610** based on a £33,145 saving per child
- Ability to work with families would be reduced (37 families were worked with from 1 April to 5 September 2017 (48% of children in these cases had, at closure, a Child in Need Plan or Child Protection Plan in place);
- Support for Child Protection Plans would be reduced (11 cases; a Child in Need Plan in 5 cases; prevented Legal Proceedings in 10 cases; supported Legal Proceedings in 11 cases; identified kinship carers in 12 cases.
- Families would be disappointed; positive feedback included 89% of adults felt the process helped and 78% felt it enabled the family to communicate better; from referrers (predominantly social care colleagues) 100% felt the process benefited the children concerned; 100% said the process fully met or exceeded their expectations (Q1 only).

With such positive outcomes to the scheme, further funding would allow this service to be embedded into mainstream services. Support could be extended to other families across Warwickshire, having already made such a positive impact in the North of the County.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

3 x Family Group Conference co-ordinators at a cost of £48.7k each pa including on costs, travel.

Refresh of the 2017-20 Savings Plan

Business Unit	Children & Families
Head of Service	Beate Wagner

Current Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal (as per OOP 2020)	Original Cash Saving			Why the saving cannot proceed as planned
		2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Outside OOP 2020 £'000	
CF-05 & CF-OOP14-18	Children Centres	1,120	1,120		Because of the large number of responses and subsequent legal advice there has been a deferment of the Cabinet report until November. In addition a commitment has been made to avoid disrupting the 2 Help Offer and to continue this to July 2018. The cost implications of this offer are not yet known, as detailed consultations with providers had to be delayed until agreement of the 0 - 5 redesign proposal by Cabinet on 9.11.2017. As a result it is prudent for a contingency element of the savings to be re-profiled on the assumption that additional costs may be incurred during the first 4 months of implementation to July 2018 of up to £93k per month.
CF-04 & CF-06	CLA Numbers reduction & CLA placement mix	2,632	5,652		It has taken a longer lead-in time for the in-house fostering recruitment campaign to gain traction, therefore we are using a higher number of external fostering placements and fewer in-house placements than anticipated. This is currently being mitigated by a lower use of residential care as the highest cost placements than budgeted for. However this mitigation is going to be difficult to sustain going forward. The Summer placement crisis that we experienced is a national issue that has been highlighted recently in the national press. As a result we had to make short term contingency arrangements locally and purchase more residential placements than we had hoped for due to the absence of agency or in-house foster placements. The calculation of £900k represents £500k slippage from 17/18 and an estimated further reduction in savings of £400k in 18/19 - ref PG-CF-06)
	Total	3,752	6,772	0	

Please note that in all cases the amount of the saving for 2018/19 and 2019/20 should be the additional amount to be delivered in future years i.e. excluding the saving to be delivered in 2017/18 where budgets have already been reduced.

Proposed Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal	Proposed Cash Saving			How does the proposal link to the OOP strategic outcomes
		2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Outside OOP 2020 £'000	
CF-05 & CF-OOP14-18	Children Centres	748	1,120		PG-CF-05 & CF-OOP14-18: (400k in 2018/19)
CF-04 & CF-06	CLA Numbers reduction & CLA placement mix	1,732	5,652		Ref PG-CF-06: (500k in 17/18 plus £400k in 18/19)
	Use of Corporate Reserves	1,272	0		
	Total	3,752	6,772	0	

Reconciliation

	2018/19 £'000	2019/20 £'000	Outside OOP 2020 £'000	
Original savings plan	3,752	6,772	0	
less				
Proposed savings plan (which includes proposed use of corporate reserves in order to balance)	3,752	6,772	0	
Total	0	0	0	

The totals on this table must all equal zero

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Customer Service
----------------------	------------------

Title
Family Information Service (FIS)

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	102	102

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Kushal Birla Date of Sign Off: 11 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Virginia Rennie Date of Sign Off: 12 September 2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

The children and families – a vision for the future model in the OOP 2020 savings plan document illustrates that making the savings relies on easy access to information advice and signposting. The aim is that if families can access accurate and up to date information at the earliest opportunity this will prevent the needs of the family from escalating, and thus the need to access more expensive specialised services.

In order to meet these requirements there are two aspects to the additional spending need in the Family Information Service:

- Increased capacity to provide information
- Additional brokerage capacity

Increased capacity to provide information including:

- Presenting all the information in an easy to access and understand format for families who wish to access the information including for those who access the information electronically by keeping webpages up to date.
- Providing a helpline for families who are unable to access the information electronically, or families who may need some extra support in accessing the information.
- Maximising use of social media to ensure that the information gets to as wide an audience as possible.
- Delivering professional briefings to ensure that our colleagues and partners who work 1:1 with families on a daily basis are aware of the Family Information Service and how to access it for example attending inset/training days in schools, team meetings in libraries, job centre, community events.
- Delivering outreach direct to families by attending appropriate events, this will include delivering a Family Information Service in the family/community hubs, this will be a bespoke service depending on the needs of the communities.

Additional brokerage capacity:

The Family Information Service brokerage service works 1:1 with families where there are barriers to them accessing services to enable them to receive the support they need and are entitled to. Typically the barriers are mental health, language and/or disability, and the areas of support accessed are around finances, housing, school attendance, domestic violence, and often a combination of these. The change in thresholds within children's social care and early help teams has resulted in an increase in referrals to the brokerage service. By delivering support at the earliest possible opportunity we can prevent debt, homelessness and escalation of need.

Increased brokerage capacity would enable early help initial assessments to be carried out by the brokerage team where there are barriers to them being completed. The brokerage team would carry out the initial assessment and identify an appropriate professional to hand the case over to at the earliest opportunity so that the needs of families aren't escalating whilst they are waiting for assessments.

Additional funding will enable us to increase the capacity of the brokerage service in order to meet the needs of Warwickshire families.

Additional support for Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)

MASH has identified that in the first 12 months 43% of their referrals were for information and advice, which equates to over 10,000 enquiries which could be delivered by the Family Information Service (FIS) leaving the MASH to deal with genuine safeguarding referrals. There is therefore a need to develop an efficient pathway for FIS to respond to these enquiries supporting both the MASH staff and resulting in an improved customer experience for the users of the service.

Reason for the Request

There is a reliance on the FIS service to deliver cost effective early intervention. In order to deliver this there is a requirement to increase the capacity of the FIS team.

The aims of the new "One Team" approach recently presented at the Children's transformation roadshows clearly shows that FIS is integral to the success of the approach. Permanent investment is required to deliver this.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

The following assumptions have been made in preparing this submission:

- Increase in demand on the brokerage service will continue at its current level
- FIS remains integral to the success of the delivery of the future children's and families model
- FIS presence in the family/community hubs is successful
- Early help hub in the MASH is a success and then used as a model for the family/community hubs
- Successful pathway for information and advice enquiries from MASH to FIS

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

1 x FIS Information Officers FT

- Provision of information, advice and sign-posting
- Pro-actively research local activities, support groups and family services and make this information available to families and professionals working with families via webpages, directory, electronic newsletter and social media.
- Develop FIS social media campaigns to increase interaction between FIS and customers
- Deliver a targeted outreach service across Warwickshire including hubs, libraries, schools, youth and community centres and relevant one off events such as festivals, cultural events and briefings

2 x FIS Brokerage Officers FT

- Deliver a confidential and impartial brokerage and complex advice service to parents who do not meet thresholds for Early Help of Social Care to prevent escalation of need and where there are barriers to them accessing services; ensuring parents are supported to access appropriate services by delivering 1:1 early intervention in a location suitable to the needs of the family, usually the family home.
- Increase the capacity to take referrals from the FIS helpline and professionals working with families in Warwickshire such as schools, children's centres, early help officers, health visitors.

1 x FIS admin support 18 hours

Provide admin support to the FIS team to enable FIS Manager, FIS Brokerage Officers and FIS Information Officers to focus on their own specialist roles.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

The FIS team currently has 5 members of staff:

1 x manager (FT)

1 x brokerage officer (30 hours)

2 x FIS officer (FT)

1 x FIS officer (30 hours)

Without the additional funding FIS would continue to provide services at the current level. There is no capacity to offer the increased support envisaged as part of the delivery of the OOP 2020 Children and Families vision for the future.

If targeted strong early information advice and support is not delivered families would reach crisis earlier and there would be an increased demand on more specialist services rather than a decrease.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Staffing has been based on current/projected demand.

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	ICT
----------------------	-----

Title
Processing statutory customer requests for access to adult and children care records, on behalf of People Group, as required under data protection legislation.

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	149	149

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Tricia Morrison Date of Sign Off: 23/11/2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Virginia Rennie Date of Sign Off: 23/11/2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

Individuals have a right to access their own personal information under the current Data Protection Act 1998. There is also the provision for specific bodies to request access for the prevention or investigation of crime. The largest and most complex area in the Council is social care records held for both children and adults. The Council are obliged under legislation to keep some care records up to 100 years. We hold paper and digital care records from the 1920's. We are required to review the entire record, remove any information they are not entitled to see and release in paper or digital form, and as such is a specialised, staff-intensive process that cannot be automated.

Social care teams were processing these requests on a team-by-team basis. In 2014 a backlog was created as they could not keep pace with the volume, and complaints were made. The Information Commissioner's Office advised us in 2015 that the Council was in breach of section 7 of the Data Protection Act 1998, as individuals are entitled to receive a response within 40 calendar days. The Commissioner can take enforcement including monetary penalties upto £500,000. The Council advised the Information Commissioner that these requests would be handled centrally, the option preferred by them. The team took on children records but not adult records, so the Council has not fully complied.

In order to prevent a further breach by operational care teams, the additional spend is required to put this on a permanent basis to handle the volume and complexity. There has been an increase in requests by individuals as well as the Police requesting access to case records, as a result of sexual exploitation investigations.

Reason for the Request

Information Management have been processing customer requests for access to their care records, on a temporary basis, since 2015. Funding was initially met by People Group for Children & Families records, and in 2017/18 by corporate funding. The principle and business case for centralising processing has been agreed by People Group (both Children & Families and Social Care & Support). However, there is no available funding in People Group to commission Information Management to continue with children records and take on adult records.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

The demand over the last 2-3 years will continue, as will the complexity of some of the family cases. It is based on volume of personal requests and the number of pages that have to be reviewed. For records disclosed to the Police and other agencies, it is based on experience using an average case. This can be complex when it involves a past care home.

The assumptions are based on the requests that have come into Information Management directly or

been passed by care teams to them. **This may be under recorded where care teams have not reported these by customers/past customers or agencies where we have a statutory duty to disclose information.**

Effort required is estimated at 3 FTEs for children requests and 1.5 FTE for adult requests, plus management time. It requires funding for 4 FTEs.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

Permanent funding for 4 additional staff in the Information Management team, plus management. Making 2 current staff on fixed term contracts permanent. Recruitment of 2 additional posts to cover vacancies and additional work for Adult social care.

Additional costs for software licences, equipment, scanning paper records and postage/courier services.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

The processing would revert back to each social care team. This would incur additional costs for software licenses and training for each team. The savings in social care time and resources estimated by service managers to process requests would mean time would be taken away from the front line customer work or the need to recruit additional social care staff.

There is no guarantee that the teams would not create another backlog, which may incur enforcement action by the Information Commissioner and fines, loss of trust by the public and reputational damage. From May 2018 new data protection legislation will apply giving individuals the right to claim compensation and fines for breaching their rights will go up to €20m. We will not be able to charge for these statutory requests, so cannot recoup any income.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Staffing costs: £144,500
Suppliers & Services: £4,500 (Scanning, postage, software)

Total: £149,000

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Customer Service
----------------------	------------------

Title
Sunday Opening at the Hub Libraries (Leamington, Nuneaton and Rugby) and maintain current opening hours at Whitnash and Lillington libraries

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent	X		
Time-Limited		Over how many years is the funding required?	
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure (Sunday Opening Hours)	56	56
Whitnash and Lillington opening hours	27	27
	83	83

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the Business Unit in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, and • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Kushal Birla Date of Sign Off: 4 September 2017</p>

Finance sign off
I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.

Strategic Finance Manager: Virginia Rennie

Date of Sign Off: 8 September 2017

Description of the Additional Spending Need

To retain Sunday opening at the hub libraries beyond 31st March 2018 and not implement the saving plan agreed as part of the 2014-18 OOP that has been deferred for two years through the allocation of one-off funding.

In addition, to retain current opening hours at Whitnash and Lillington libraries after Warwick District Council informed us of their intention to withdraw one stop shop service delivery and staffing from these libraries.

Reason for the Request

As part of the One Organisational Plan 2014-18 for Customer Service, the Library Service was required to make progress against a range of specific savings. These savings included:

- CS-D/G/J - Improve the effectiveness of the whole library network. A saving of £100,000 for the Library service.

£54,000 of this saving was achieved by the withdrawal of the Sunday Library Service which is delivered at the three main hub libraries of Rugby, Leamington and Nuneaton. The withdrawal of Sunday opening hours would enable enhanced payments and salary reductions to be offered as a saving.

During the budget setting process of February 2016 Council granted the service a one-off budget enhancement of £108,000 to allow the 3 libraries to remain open on Sundays for a further two years. This one-off funding ends on 31st March 2018.

A permanent budget allocation is required to retain Sunday opening beyond 31st March 2018.

In addition, Warwick District Council have informed us of their intention to withdraw from Lillington and Whitnash libraries. The implications are that at Whitnash Library, to retain the current opening hours would cost £13,500 and the same figure to retain the current opening hours at Lillington Library

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

The assumptions made in preparing this submission are:

- Opening hours are maintained at existing staffing levels.

- Roles and salary grades of staff working in the named sites remain unchanged.
- Public demand continues at present level

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

To pay for the staffing required to maintain the existing opening hours at the libraries.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

If funding is not identified the service will need to close the three libraries on Sundays (subject to consultation) as previously proposed and reduce opening hours at the other two.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

Please see above - based on existing staffing levels including on costs

Refresh of the 2017-20 Savings Plan

Business Unit	Property Services
Head of Service	Steve Smith

Current Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal (as per OOP 2020)	Original Cash Saving		Why the saving cannot proceed as planned
		2018/19	2019/20	
		£'000	£'000	
RG-PA-07	Reduce property costs in Warwick by vacating the Barrack Street block and accommodating staff in other existing premises	0	250	Whilst the plans to vacate and dispose of Barrack Street are progressing the £250,000 saving is the full year saving. To deliver this would require the building to be vacated and declared surplus to requirements by March 2019. The current plan shows this happening in the last quarter of 2019/20, meaning the full year saving will not be delivered until 2020/21.
Total		0	250	

Proposed Savings Plan

Reference	Description of the savings proposal	Proposed Cash Saving		How does the proposal link to the OOP strategic outcomes
		2018/19	2019/20	
		£'000	£'000	
RG-PA-03	Reduction in the Council's borrowing costs as a result of using capital receipts from the sale of land and buildings (both urban sites and smallholdings) to reduce long term debt	0	250	This is an increase in an existing savings plan. It is consistent with the OOP priority of making the most effective use of our resources. A programme of disposals is in place that, if delivered, would deliver this saving.
Total		0	250	

Reconciliation

		2018/19	2019/20	
		£'000	£'000	
	Original savings plan	0	250	
	less			
	Proposed savings plan	0	250	
Total		0	0	

2018/19 Spending Need

Business Unit	Other Services (Transformation)
----------------------	---------------------------------

Title
Digital First Transformation Programme

Is the spending need (please mark with an 'X' as appropriate)			
Permanent			
Time-Limited	x	Over how many years is the funding required?	One
One-off			

Cost Profile	2018/19 £000	2019/20 £000
Cost of pressure	2,500	0

Head of Service sign off
<p>In submitting the request for funding the Head of Service is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirming the spending need is a priority for the organisation in contributing to the delivery the corporate priorities and objectives, • Satisfied with both the content of the bid and the rigour with which the business case has been compiled, an • Willing to accept accountability for the use of the funding in accordance with the proposal as outlined and within the timeframe and cost envelope included. <p>Responsible Head of Service: Claire Corbett Date of Sign Off: 28/11/2017</p>

Finance sign off
<p>I confirm that the financial impact of the spending need has been critically assessed and that all known financial risks, assumptions and uncertainties are adequately reflected.</p> <p>Strategic Finance Manager: Virginia Rennie Date of Sign Off: 28/11/2017</p>

Description of the Additional Spending Need

Capabilities in digital technologies have helped councils take a more ambitious approach to shaping their services. Our customers can already do a huge amount on line. These capabilities enable customers to use their smartphone, tablet or PC to arrange appointments, request services, seek information and advice and complete transactions.

Customer expectations around digital access and ease of doing things online have increased and will continue to do so at pace. Councils face dealing with huge volumes of requests for data and information. The need to continue to make investment in digital capabilities to help pinpoint customers who need support, improve their outcomes and transact with the Council on line is required.

Customers require seamless integration across council services; this means customers verifying who they are once. Investment in digital platforms and data sharing will help Councils become enablers of their customers rather than direct providers of local services.

Through further digital transformation, we will enable customers to make connections across all service areas including adults and children's social care. We will deliver our Digital Front Door as outlined in our OOP2020 Vision. Face-to-face contact will still be required, however, new digital tools will help people to manage their own long term conditions and connect to a broader network of support, friends, family and volunteers.

The next phase will also integrate the Council's digital platforms more seamlessly. Instead of a static website, council digital services will be modelled on digital platforms such as Amazon, Facebook etc. They will connect people to others providing recommendations to their specific needs and allow for a more interactive personal experience, ensuring they don't feel alienated by channel shift.

The programme will ensure digital inclusion is high on the agenda, ensuring those customers who are vulnerable and unable to access services on line are not disadvantaged. However, information on digital platforms is adapted for people with language and literacy difficulty and we will continue to provide in-person navigation support through libraries and community facilities.

Reason for the Request

The OOP 2020 Transformation Programme has a dedicated work stream: Digital First, seeking to deliver further improvements in service redesign using digital capabilities.

Our Digital First Transformation Programme is not just about putting things on line, it is about transforming our service offer around the need of the customer. We will transform the way we work, becoming more efficient, commercial and innovative in how we deliver our services.

The Digital First Programme will emphasis on saving money and improving the customer service experience.

The Digital First Transformation Programme will start with understanding the needs of the customer first, getting a better understanding of how our customers want to interact with the Council and then redesigning our service offer through to our back office.

The programme already has a number of projects underway. However, in parallel we will seek further opportunities for digital transformation to deliver a better customer experience and efficiency savings, this phase will be the Discovery Phase. During this discovery phase the programme team will work directly with customers researching their needs and using this research to inform the redesign of the digital offer. The programme will continue to make further improvements to our existing digital transactional web site. The programme will explore capabilities available on the market and being used by other organisations and Councils to maximise on developments that are already in place.

Key to the success of the digital transformation will be having the right skills and the appropriate level of resource capability to deliver the programme. Some skills will be sourced externally; however, a comprehensive skills transfer programme will be put in place to ensure we can build our own capabilities in digital transformation over the longer term.

What assumptions have been made in preparing this submission?

e.g. current trends in demand/cost increases will continue to the end of OOP 2020

375,003 transactions have been completed by our Customers since 1/4/17, via on-line, face to face, telephone and by post. Of these, 233,034 were completed on line, representing at 62% take up rate on digital channels, with 38% preferring more traditional channels.

- 93% of adults have mobile phones (Office of National Statistics - figures for West Midlands 31/3/16), 81% of all households have internet access (Office of National Statistics - figures for West Midlands 31/3/16)
- 10.2% of all adults in Warwickshire are not online
- 78% of all adults have digital skills
- 45% have used these skills in the last 3 months

Councils across the UK continue to invest in digital solutions and enabling infrastructure. Several Councils are investing in the use of artificial intelligence, robotic software and Chatbot's to deliver new and improved ways for customers to fulfil their service requests with their Council.

How will the funding be used to meet the additional need?

The funding will be used to build further digital platform capabilities and specialist resources to deliver the digital transformation redesign of services across the Council.

What actions would be necessary if the funding was not provided and how would this affect the OOP 2020 outcomes?

Efficiency savings in the front and back office would be put at risk and sought from other areas. The delivery of the Digital Front Door, a key objective of the OOP2020 Vision, would not be delivered.

How has the cost been calculated? (Please attach a separate working paper if needed)

The cost has been calculated using benchmarks of other Council's planned and delivered investments made in digital transformation.